IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION (L) NO. 2020 OF 2006

Maharashtra Suraksha Rakshak Aghadi ... Petitioner

V/s.

The Security Guards Board for Greater Bombay & Thane District & Ors. ... Respondent

Mr. Susheel Mahendeshwar with Ms. Ranjana Todankar for the petitioner.
Mrs. Lata Desai for respondent No.1.
Mr. S.A. Balwal i/b. Vyas & Balwal for respondent No.2.

CORAM : F.I. REBELLO &
ANOOP V. MOHTA,JJ.
DATED : 29th August, 2006

P.C.

. It is admitted position that the respondent No.2 is registered with respondent No.1 and in-fact was first getting guards from respondent No. 1. It is pointed out that respondent No. 2 has engaged private guards through respondent No.3. If that be the case, it will be in contravention of the provisions of the Security Guards Act and the Security Guards Scheme. The respondent No. 1 to take action against respondent No. 2. The member of the petitioner on whose behalf the petition is filed can apply to the respondent No. 1 for registration. If they do so, respondent No. 1 to consider their application and take steps, not later than four weeks

from today.

2. On behalf of the respondent No. 1, the learned counsel states that action has already been taken.

3. On instructions, the respondent No. 2 makes statement that they will recruit guards from respondent No. 1 only. Statement is accepted.

4. The petition is disposed of accordingly.

[F.I. REBELLO, J.]

[ANOOP V. MOHTA, J.]